

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Buprestis angustula* Illiger, 1803 (Insecta, Coleoptera) over *Buprestis pavida* Fabricius, 1793

Ted C. MacRae

Monsanto Co. 700 Chesterfield Parkway West, Chesterfield, Missouri, 63017, U.S.A.

(e-mail: ted.c.macrae@monsanto.com)

I would like to comment on Case 3388, “*Buprestis angustula* Illiger, 1803 (Insecta, Coleoptera) . . .”, by E. Jendek (2007, BZN 64(3): 178–180). I support the proposed precedence of the specific name over that of *Buprestis pavida* whenever the two are considered synonyms. I agree with the author that the interest of stability is best served by maintaining precedence of this long-used name for a common, widely-distributed species.

Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of *Archaeopteryx lithographica* von Meyer, 1861 (Aves) by designation of a neotype

(Case 3390; see BZN 64: 1–3)

Paul M. Barrett & Angela C. Milner

Department of Palaeontology, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

We write in support of Bock & Bühler's proposal to set aside the holotype specimen of *Archaeopteryx lithographica* von Meyer, 1861 and to conserve this name by designation of a neotype specimen BMNH 37001 (the ‘London specimen’), for the following reasons.

Firstly, the holotype specimen is a single feather preserved in part and counterpart (see Bühler & Bock, 2002). Although it could be argued that this could have been sufficiently diagnostic to form the basis for a new taxon at the time of description, as no other birds were then known from Mesozoic deposits and therefore the mere presence of feathers could have been used as a diagnostic character, new discoveries have rendered any potentially diagnostic features of this specimen obsolescent (*sensu* Wilson & Upchurch, 2003). These include the discoveries of spectacularly preserved Mesozoic birds and non-avian dinosaurs with very similar feathers from the Lower Cretaceous Jehol Biota of China (e.g. Chang et al., 2003): as a result, the presence of feathers alone can no longer be regarded as potentially diagnostic. Furthermore, these finds demonstrate that isolated feathers are not sufficiently distinct in terms of morphology to permit referral to any particular Mesozoic bird taxon. As a result, it is possible that the holotype specimen of *Archaeopteryx lithographica* may not be referable to the same taxon as that represented by the skeletal specimens usually referred to this species. This is particularly important as some authorities contend that several bird species lived alongside *A. lithographica* in the Solnhofen environment on the basis of osteological evidence (e.g. Elzanowski, 2002).